



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/771,380

02/05/2004

Tokio Ooi

118520

3333

25944

7590

04/06/2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC

P.O. BOX 320850

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER

HENDRICKSON, STUART L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1793

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/06/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/771,380	<b>Applicant(s)</b> OOI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Stuart Hendrickson	<b>Art Unit</b> 1793	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/25/09.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 1793

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action. The RCE is accepted.

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Walker 3638399 taken with Hayden 5466645.

Walker teaches in col. 2 and 4 treating active carbon having a wide pore size distribution with gaseous naphthalene and like compounds until it is saturated. No differences are seen in the carbon or the effect of the treatment. Note also the cooling of ex. 5. Concerning claim 5, it is implied, however to the extent that it is not taught, it is an obvious expedient to avoid burn-off of the carbon. Walker does not explicitly teach cooling in inert gas, however Hayden does in a similar process. Using this cooling is an obvious expedient to avoid burning of the active carbon and thus preserving its pore structure, consistent with the Walker teachings.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Nakano article taken with Hayden.

Nakano teaches, especially on pgs. 2, 3, contacting molecular sieve carbon (ie, active carbon) with naphthalene and like compounds at 200C and heating in inert gas. Concerning claims 4 and 5, they are implied, however to the extent not taught, are an obvious expedient to avoid burning the carbon.

Nakano does not explicitly teach cooling in inert gas, however Hayden does in a similar process. Using this cooling is an obvious expedient to avoid burning of the active carbon and thus preserving its pore structure.

Applicant's arguments filed 2/25/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Berger has been withdrawn, but only because of the amendment made and not because of what was argued. The other references need not tell explicitly the effect of the process. The

Art Unit: 1793

argument on pg. 6 shows exactly why the claimed effect is achieved: the large pores are filled and only the small pores remain. Thus, the small pores now are 94% of the volume. Walker reactivates- again, possibly because the pores were in fact filled as recited in the claim verbiage. No differences are seen. The proper spelling of inventor 'Ooi' is requested.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Hendrickson at telephone number (571) 272-1351.

/Stuart Hendrickson/  
Primary examiner Art Unit 1793